(*b*) whether they are aware that by such late circulars, the parents and the students are put to hardship ?

A.—Sri S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Education).—

(*a*) Rules have been framed as suggested by Director of Public Instruction codifying existing practices.

(*b*) No.

Calling Attention Notice *re*: Death of Sri N. G. Channiah of Nuggehally, Channarayapatna Taluk.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does not Sri Lakkappa think that the matter has been sufficiently discussed in the Appropriation Bill ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ (ಹೆಬ್ಬೂರು).—ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಜತ್ತಿಯವರು ಮೊನ್ನೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ವರದಿ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ವಿಚಾರ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ......

Mr. SPEAKER.—If necessary, I will hold it over. Or I will permit the Hon'ble Member ; they will reply and the matter will be closed. If it suits the convenience of the Chief Minister he may reply now or I will leave it to him to decide when to reply.

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum-I).—I expect a full answer from the Hon'ble the Chief Minister.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—I will give a short reply now which may not satisfy the Members.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The work must be thorough.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—I will give a detailed reply if it is on some other day.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will postpone it to the next non-official day. The Minister for Home while replying to the Nuggehally incident the other day said that he had no better information and that he would supply it as and when it was gethered. If he has got more information than the Finance Minister has given the other day, I shall take up this question to-day. Otherwise, I would like to have it on some other day. The other difficulty is that it might become *sub judice* afterwards.

Sri R. M. PATIL (Minister for Home).—I have got the information.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then, I will allow the Member to move the motion. My anxiety is that if it is delayed and if it becomes *sub judice*, the jurisdiction of the House will be ousted.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—The Hon'ble Finance Minister promised to furnish all the necessary particulars and documents to the House and he said that a full-dress debate might take place on that, therefore, if the Hon'ble Speaker permits me and the other side to discuss the subject matter on the Floor of the House for three Hours......

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is nothing like a full-dress Debate on a particular point unless there is a Resolution. I belive the matter has been discussed to some extent more than once in the Debate that took place on some of the Demands and also the whole of the time allotted for the Appropriation Bill was utilised for this purpose and a reply was given by the Hon'ble the Finance Minister. He did not give full information and he said that if there was anything more, he would tell the House later on. It is in that light that I may permit Sri K. Lakkappa to move the call attention motion. Before he moves it, I would like to mention to the Members that there is considerable difference in the procedure followed by the various legislatures. In fact, one of the Members of the Opposition, Sri S. M Krishna, said that in the past I was allowing one or two supplementaries or clarifications after the reply of the Minister concerned. Lateron, I discontinued it on a strict interpretation of the rule. I have made a study of this question and I am prepared to place all the concerned books and references in this behalf before the Hon'ble Members if they want to go through them. To say that 'I want this or I want that' is neither fair to the House nor to any one of us. If necessary, I will deal with it at a later date. I am only inviting the attention of the House to this so that Members may not tell me afterwards that they did not know it.

Sri S. SIVAPPA (Sravanabelagola).—In Lok Sabha they allow clarifications, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is why I am putting all these things. The strict interpretation I have put is not wrong. I want to modify the rule if necessary and I am anxious to do it. But let us follow some procedure.

Sri G. V. GOWDA (Palya).—Let us postpone this matter till we make sure about the procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have no objection to postpone it but it must be left to the discretion of the individual, who has tabled it.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The subject matter of this call-attention motion is a very urgent and serious issue. It has been discussed for a short time in this House day before yesterday. The Hon'ble Finance Minister seems to have replied to it and he said that he was going to collect more information and place the entire report before this House. I request the Chair to see that the Government places that report before the House early so that we can know what they are going to do. They may seek shelter under *sub judice*. In order to avoid that, I have made the above request.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Sivappa has not told me whether he wants me to take it up to-day or not. And Sri K. Lakkappa is hesitant.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ಮೊದಲೇ ತಾವು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರಿ. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ದಿವಸ ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದ್ದರೆ ನೋಡೋಣವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let the Members not misunderstand me. I have never said that there would be a discussion. Whether clarifications or supplementaries should be allowed is the point that I am considering. Even in regard to this call-attention motion, I am prepared to allow supplementaries but there is nothing like a discussion or a debate.

Now Members are discussing here amongst themselves. Somebody imitates me and says 'I am feeling unhappy'.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಚನ್ನರಾಯಪಟ್ಟಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ನುಗ್ಗೆಹಳ್ಳಿಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಜಿ. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ ಎಂಬುವರೊಬ್ಬರು 22ನೆಯ ಮಾರ್ಚಿ 1965ರಂದು ಮರಣ ಹೊಂದಿದ ಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸಿರುವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಒಳಾಡಳಿತ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ತರಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Sir......

Mr. SPEAKER.—In a Call Attention Notice the Minister can ask for time if he is not ready. If he is ready he must make a statement.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—I am in possession of some materials......

Sri B. BHASKER SHETTY (Kaup).—We want full details. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಕಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಪೋಸ್ಟ್‌ಪೋನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—The Hon'ble Minister was pleased to state that he is not having all the information with respect to the incident.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I can see that the Home Minister is going to report something and that is only a Police Report. What we have demanded is judicial enquiry, but the report of the Home Minister is purely Department Police Report and that will not solve the problem. So I request you to direct the Government to state whether they are prepared to order a judicial enquiry or not. That is the essence of the thing because we know that what the Police are going to say will not solve the problem.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is abundant common sense in what the Leader of the Opposition says. But procedure has to be fitted in. If you want a judicial enquiry you have to follow a procedure. I do not know whether all that can come in a call attention notice. Let me first of all decide the fate of this call attention motion. What has Sri K. Lakkappa to say about his call attention notice?

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—In reply to the call attention motion the Minister will say something, but that will not solve the problem.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. I am asking Sri K. Lakkappa to tell what he wants to say.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣ ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ (ತಿಪಟೂರು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಕಾಲ್ ಅಟೆನ್‌ಷನ್ ನೋಟೀಸು ವಿಷಯ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಆಫೀಸರು ಅಫಿಷಿಯಲ್ ಗ್ಯಾಲರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೇ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಆಫೀಸರೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣ ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಆಫೀಸರು ಅಲ್ಲ, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನ್ ಅಫಿಷಿಯಲ್ ಮೆಂಬರು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. There seems to be no limit to the members dragging the proceedings. Sri K. P. Revannasiddappa, was said 'Officer' Is it 'Officer' that the member is having in his mind?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಭಾಸ್ಕರಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಈ ಕೇಸಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಸನ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರು ಅಫಿಷಿಯಲ್ ಗ್ಯಾಲರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಸರಿಯೇ ಎಂದು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪನವರು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is that a point of order? Who wants to support that point of order? Let me know which is the rule that is violated. A point of order is raised for a breach of the rules. Is there any rule that the member has got in mind for raising this point of order? I will give a copy of the Rules to him Let him point out to me the rule that he has in mind?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO (Mysore City).—With reference to this point of order, I would like to know from the Chair, is there any bar for any citizen of this country watching the proceedings of this House sitting from wherever he is permitted to sit?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Who would like to support the point of order?

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—I would like to support the point of order raised by Sri Revannasiddappa.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let the Hon'ble Member point out the rule first.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು ಆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್‌ಫ್ಲುಯೆನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅಂಥಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸ ಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಎತ್ತಿದಾಗ ನಾನು ರೂಲ್ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಚಲೋ ಆಧಾರ ರೂಲ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದಿರುವಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ರೂಲೂ voilate ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಒಳಗಡೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಪರ್ಮಿಷನ್ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡು ಪಾಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದು ತಪ್ಪು ಎಂದು ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಅವರು ಪರ್ಮಿಷನ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದು ಅದೇನೂ ತಪ್ಪಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ಎನ್. ಜಿ. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ ಎನ್ನುವವರು ತಮಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾಗದವನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಅವರು ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಎಸ್. ನಿಜಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಗೃಹಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳವರಿಗೂ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಕಾಗದವನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಕಾಗದವನ್ನು ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನವರ ಪ್ರಭಾವ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಇದೆ, ಅವರು ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಗೂಂಡಾಗಿರಿಯನ್ನು, ದೌರ್ಜನ್ಯವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಬಿ. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯನವರು ಅವರ ಕಾಗದದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆತನ ಮರಣಕ್ಕೆ ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಿಜಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪನವರು ಮತ್ತು ಆ ಸಬ್-ಇನ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟರೇ ಕಾರಣರೆಂದು ಆ ಕಾಗದದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವನು ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಮಗೂ ಒಂದು ಕಾಗದ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಾವಿಜನ್ ಮೂಲಕ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಅದನ್ನು ಇಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಈಗ ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನನ್ನ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಒಂದು ಮಿತಿ ಇರಬೇಕು. ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ನೋಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ತಮಗೂ ಒಂದು ಕಾಗದ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಈ ಕೇಸಿನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಭಾವವನ್ನು ಬೀರುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕು, ಮತ್ತು ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If members want to spend time like this I have no objection, but it is not be fitting the House. Is this a private conversation? It is a point of order that is sought to be raised and I explained the procedure so far as I understand it. After that, if any member wants to support the point of order, he may do so. Still without knowing the rule, simply going on adding facts or words or verbocity, leads us no where. Why not we adhere to rules some extent?

If we don't do that, it does not look nice to anybody; it does not reflect well. Let us adhere to rules. Now, I ask Sri K. Lakkappa to say if he has anything to say to the point?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ಕಾಗದದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಕಾಣಿಸಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರು ಗ್ಯಾಲರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು..............

Mr. SPEAKER.—If I don't allow the members, the members feel hurt. The correct procedure is either you call attention or don't call attention. If the point of order is still to be considered there must be a better study. Without study if a member goes on saying things, it will not serve any purpose. Not only he is drawing attention to other facts but he must remember that he is using the valuable time allotted ror the Non-official Business. He is drawing attention to the presence of an officer who is helpless again to reply to it. Members must have better sense of responsibility. I am trying to smoothen the matter. If members simply get up and speak, no purpose would be served. On the other hand, the valuable time allotted for the non-official business is frittered away.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Sir, I want a ruling. Whether he can sit in the officials gallery when discussion is going on, is the point of order raised by Sri K. P. Revanna Siddappa. We want a ruling as to who are entitle to sit in the officials gallery.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rulings are not doled out as and when members ask for. On the point of order I have given a ruling that I am not aware of any rule where I can ask any person in the gallery to clear out unless it be when there is a secret session. When there is a secret session any person who is in the gallery can be asked to retire. There is no rule by which I can ask any person to clear out unless he misbehaves or when it amounts to a contempt. I cannot ask that he cannot be there. A point of order is raised and his name is dragged. I do not know whether it is corrct or otherwise. I do not have facts before me. I have only to follow the procedure. According to the procedure, admission to the gallery is in the manner indicated. There is no point of order and I have rejected the point of order of Sri Revanna Siddappa I also reject the point of order if it is intended by Sri K. Lakkappa, if it is in an implied fashion. I think the Minister for Home will reply.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ತಮ್ಮ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ: ಗೃಹ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಒಂದು ಕಾಗದ ಬಂದಿದೆ; ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನೂ ಇಡುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Why not the member go and meet the Home Minister? Is there anything standing in the way of their going and meeting him? Or do they think that they are too big? If they ask for information, I am sure he will certainly give.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣ ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ನಾವು ಬಹಳ ಸಾರಿ ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಹೋಂ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರ ಮನೆಗೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದೆವು ಅದು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮುಗಿದು ಹೋಗಿ, ಪ್ರಾಣಹತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿತು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣ ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳುವದ ತಪ್ಪು, ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಎಂದಿಗೂ ನನ್ನ ಕಡೆ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ,..............

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon'ble Home Minister may please make a statement.

Sri V. M. DEO (Gubbi).—Sir, some other aspect other than the one aspect raised here, is there. Am I right in surmising that it is the same case with you also because you are an intelligent person ?

(*Laughter*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—My intelligence makes me to request the member to resume his seat.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Maddur).—Sir, I understand the position here, the Hon'ble Home Minister is ready to make a statement in reply to the call attention motion given by my friend Sri K. Lakkappa. If the Hon'ble Minister is not in custody of all the facts of the case, no useful purpose would be served by the Minister making a statement. After all of us are interested to get at, the facts that are involved in this unfortunate incident. If the Hon'ble Home Minister is not completely ready with all the facts then, I personally feel some more time be given to him. At the same time he must make every effort to get at the facts. Even though some of the facts are unpalatable to the treasury benches or to some of the persons in whom the treasury benches are interested, nevertheless we request him not to take any partisan attitude. This is a serious matter where an ordinary citizen of the State has lost his life That will make people lose faith in the law and order and in the rule of law. It is in this light that I would like the Hon'ble Home Minister to ponder over the question. If he is not ready with all the facts, no harm would be done by postponing this. After the person is dead and gone, no harm will be done if this is postponed to get at all the facts.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I mentioned that on the call attention there is no chance for Debate. Debate took place on the subject at the time of the discussion of the Budget. Debate took place on the Appropriation Bill. The only point that was weighing with me then was, why should I shut out anything that might come in the course of the reply. The Hon'ble Home Minister was not present when reply was given. The Finance Minister, naturally in charge of the Bill furnished information that was in his possession and said if necessary he would get any report and place it before the House. He was correct to that extent. This left the door a little open and not completely closed. It is in that light I considered whether this should not be permitted to be raised. I asked Sri Lakkappa; I, explained the situation. We are adjourning to meet after some time. By that time another factor might come into operation. The matter may become *subjudice*. In the light of this I made a request to the Home Minister that he might make a statement. I am only here to see that we follow proper procedure. It is for the Minister to make a statement now or not.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Sir, I have sufficient information to make a statement on the call attention motion. If I am asked to make a statement I will make.

Now I am making a statement as my friends have asked for it.

In response to the call attention notice, I beg to submit to this House that Sri N. G. Channayya of Nuggehalli, Channarayapatna Taluk, Hassan District, committed suicide. The village Nuggehalli is situated in Tiptur-Channarayapatna Road, about 36 miles from Hassan and 20 miles from Tiptur. It has a population of over 3,000 consisting of various communities. The majority of them are agriculturists. This village is a Hobli headequarter and it has police station attached to Arasikere circle. In the past there were several complaints and counter complaints from the parties headed by Sri N. G. Narasimhe Gowda on the one side,.........

Mr. SPEAKER.—Are the names essential ? If absolutely essential I have no objection.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—They are essential and those that are not essential, I will omit.

......and his brother N. G. Kempanna on the other side. The former belonged to the P.S.P. party and the latter to the Congress party. These complaints were being personally enquired into from time to time by senior police officers and the Deputy Inspector General of Police, Southern Range.

10-00 A.M.

He was trying his best to get the Sub-Inspector transferred out. Actually it was proposed to transfer the Sub-Inspector. Subsequently it was cancelled because, it may lead to an inference of favouritism to any one of them. But the Inspector General of Police himself had informed the Government that if Narasimhe Gowda was not satisfied with the action taken by the Police, he could take recourse to such legal action as was open to him. Despite this, the complaints kept pouring. The Inspector General was asked to study the Constitution personally and he had after his personal inspection given clear directive to the Police personnel *i.e.*, Sub-Inspector and the Circle Inspector to take necessary preventive measures to avoid serious incidents and also to act firmly and impartially against the culprits to whichever faction they may belong. Since 1962. 11 cases were registered by the Police against the disputing factions, in which six cases related to Sri Narasimhe Gowda and his partymen including Channiah as accused or respondents. Similarly there were 5 cases in which Kempe Gowda and his partymen were the accused or respondents and it should be mentioned that all the 11 cases were under the Indian Penal Code for various acts of assaults or outrages committed by these rival quarrelsome persons. In 1964 there were only two cases necessitating action against the parties concerned. There was only one case against Channiah under Section 379. The complaint in this particular case was that Sri Narasimhe Gowda and Channiah had removed manure belonging to Village Panchayat, Nuggehalli, by obtaining bogus license from Village Panchayat Chairman Sri Puttappa. This case was discharged on 12th January 1964. Government are at present in possession of a letter purported to have been writ-

(SRI R. M. PATIL)

ten by Channaiah on 19th March 1965 addressed to the Chief Minister, Home Minister, Inspector General of Police, the Speaker, Legislative Assembly, Sri S. Sivappa and Sri S. M. Krishna and Sri Anjanappa obtained by the Police along with a photostat copy. After the death of Channaiah another letter was also found in his person of which a copy has been obtained. Then it is to be expected that when such accute friction prevailed between the two parties headed by blood brothers, allegations against Sub-Inspector for any action taken by him to preserve Law and Order was only natural. These allegations have however been enquired into from time to time by senior Police Officers and the Department and were found to be false. The Police Officers have at no time shown any partiality to avoid frictions and have always treated several complaints solely on their merits as evidenced by the fact that both parties have been proceeded against under Section 107 of the Criminal Procedure Code and complaints of each party against the other have also been duly registered and investigated. The failure or success of cases depended purely on the quality of evidence of witnesses deposed. Several cases are still *sub judice*. Some have been acquitted and some have also been compounded. But in no case have the Courtes called into question the investigation by the Police. It is therefore not true that they were being harassed or that the Villagers had spent Rs. 15 lakhs on litigation criminal proceedings, bribes, etc., as mentioned in the letter purporated to have been written to the Chief Minister and others. In the letter found on the body of the deceased and purported to have been written by Channaiah, it appeared, that he decided to end his life by consuming folidol for the following reasons :

> "That fate had decreed that one of them should die. The talk in the Town was that the brothers were responsible for the ruination of the Village. The poor people were ruined by the quarrel among the brothers. Harassment of the Police. Financial worries and that he was disgusted by the above out of regard for his self-respect."

The case under Section 174 Cr. Procedure Code is still under investigation. Sir, as regards examination of Viscera and all that has been found, it runs like this :

Viscera and other articles were duly examined by the Chemical Examiner who has issued a certificate to the effect that the contents of Viscera, the stains on the clothes vomit matter and the bottle seized by the Police contained Nitrophenal derivative (Presumably an insecticide containing Parathian) and he has also opined that folidol contains parathian which has organophosphorus compound containing nitrophenol derivative.

Secondly, one more aspect is, all these letters are perported to have been written by one and the same hand and perhaps it can be proved

that Channiah has written all these letters. That is also a fact. Now coming to the financial position of channiah during the time of his death, perhaps those difficulties led him to this catastrophe.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will adjourn now for half-an-hour.

The House adjourned for Recess at Ten Minutes past Ten of the Clock and re-assembled at Forty Minutes past Ten of the Clock.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Sir, the investigation revealed that the deceased Channaiah was a confirmed gambler. He used to gamble both at Nuggehalli and Channarayapatna. He was also indebted heavily. He had incurred loans to the tune of about thirteen thousand and odd rupees from various persons. It has been revealed that before his death he passed receipts in favour of certain persons from whom he had borrowed money about three years back and he has also passed receipts for having received fertilizers, which he had received on behalf of a Society.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—On a Point of Order, Sir. The whole issue has arisen out of the letter written by the deceased Channaiah. In that letter, Mr. Channaiah has never said anything about his financial position. He has given special reasons as to why he committed suicide. Only such of those points which he has raised in the letter are necessary and must be considered. I want to know whether his financial position, debts and assets have got any relevance and whether that has got anything to do here ? This is only side-tracking the whole issue and by putting off the issue, the Hon'ble Minister is making a case for the Police people. Unnecessary details are drawn into to spoil the case. Let not the Hon'ble Minister go away from the points.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Sir......

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is the Hon. member supporting the Point of Order ?

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—I am supporting the Point of Order raised by my friend, the Leader of the Opposition. The Hon'ble Minister has to place all the records and relevant documents, if any, and he is expected to speak only on those documents. But the Hon'ble Minister in his reply refers to issues which are not found here and also burking the facts of the case which is being investigated by the Police in order to hush up the case. Therefore, it will prejudice further investigation of the case. The death of Channaiah is entirely due to the Sub-Inspector alone. It is more or less an extra judicial function. So, that issue cannot be raised nor any defence put up by the Hon'ble Minister in order to sidetrack the issue. The Point of Order raised is quite relevant and a Ruling may be given.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Speaker is also entitled to ask for the assistance of others if he feels necessary. If I call upon any Hon'ble Member, that Hon'ble Member must not feel embarrassed. I am mentioning this to study what has been stated by Sri Sivappa and Sri K. Lakkappa and when the Hon'ble Minister is making a statement how far I can say, 'he should refer to this; he should not refer to that', is the point. I do not know whether it is a Point of Order at all. If the Point of Order is to be raised, the Hon'ble Member must tell me which is the Rule not followed. How many times have I to tell the House and the Members? If they cannot understand the concept of the Point of Order, what am I to do? Will the Hon'ble the Leader of the Opposition tell me which Rule he has got in his mind?

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, you as a great Lawyer know how these things will vitiate or prejudice the proceedings.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is that the Rule? Can Sri V. S. Patil tell me anything in support of it? If he feels embarrassed, he need not. Will the Hon'ble Minister for Law enlighten me whether there is any Rule under which I can say that the Point of Order is upheld?

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Minister for Law).—There does not appear to be any Rule under which a Minister as the spokesman of the Government making a reply by way of a statement answering a demand for placing information before the House, can be required to refer to this document or not to refer to a document or being required to make the statement in any particnlar manner fancied by an Hon'ble Member sitting in the Opposition. It is entirely for the Hon'ble Minister to make a statement with the information which he has in his possession, whether he considers it sufficient or not a matter on which the Chair takes a decision it is not for the Hon'ble Member sitting in the Opposition to require the Minister, who is making a statement, to make it in a particular manner or to omit to make a reference to such documents as they may have in their mind; it is entirely for him to make a statement in the manner which he thinks fit. If the Hon'ble Members are not satisfied, it is for them to think what course they should pursue if they attach so much importance to this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will give my Ruling.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, this is a very important subject and a considered opinion from the Chair is required to enlighten us all on this matter. The point is, when the explanation or the information is to be laid before this House by the Treasury Benches, if that information is based upon certain documents, we cannot challenge it because it is his discretion. But, if while giving the information, the Hon'ble Minister tries to save some of the persons who are really implicated or against whom strong suspicion is there about the happenings, then Sir, we fear by the statement of the Hon'ble Minister it is likely that the course of justice may be hampered. That appears to be the doubt which is created by our Leader on this side.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not asking on the merits of the arguments because I am not concerned with it.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—As for me, I don't think, that it is a Point of Order; but it is practically a request not to save the culprits by making a statement here.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not know how to lock up the mouth of my good friend Sri K. Lakkappa. After all, we must follow the rules. A point of order is to be raised for violation of any rule. There is no rule under which I can say that the Hon'ble Minister should make a statement in a particular manner. Coming down even to the details, he refers to a document to which specific attention has been invited by certain members on the Opposition. They have said there are two documents. One is a letter addressed and copied to so many persons; another is a letter found in the custody of the deceased when he committed suicide. Relating to those two letters he is mentioning the circumstances which have to be taken note of in arriving at the conclusion on the statement. We are still at the stage of calling attention; we are not debating it; there is no resolution; if the Hon'ble Minister feels that in fairness to fulness of the statement that he wants to make, he has to refer to a document, I want to know under which rule I can say that he must not refer to it. I cannot possibly shut him out, and say he is referring to matters which are not being mentioned. The charge is the Sub-Inspector has done something which he should not have done or he is guilty or at any rate he has abused his position as an officer and therefore the Government must be held responsible and the Government must not try to protect him and the Government must not try to exonerate him. The Minister is called upon to make a statement. He makes the statement. I cannot possibly find any excuse to say that the Minister is going wrong. Finally, last little facet was mentioned by Sri V. S. Patil and that is, it is likely to prejudice. I am unable with insufficient material to come to any conclusion nor can anybody in the House come to any conclusion in respect of either departmental enquiry or judicial enquiry or criminal enquiry that they are attempting to shield him. Therefore Sri V. S. Patil very wisely said impliedly that it is requested to see that nobody's interests are prejudiced. Beyond that, there is nothing. Therefore, I cannot understand how I can uphold the contention of Sri K. Lakkappa or Sri Shivappa. Sri Shivappa also must try hereafter atleast to say this is the rule that he is relying regarding the point of order. I will try to be of help as much as possible. Today I am becoming helpless in the matter. Sri R. M. Patil may continue.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—The deceased also requested the Registrar of Co-operative Societies to postpone the audit even though the Department was insisting for auditing the accounts of the Society of which the deceased was the President. At his request, they postponed it twice. When they insisted for audit, he thought that the misappropriations that he had made would be revealed. Accordingly he wrote a letter to the Assistant Registrar in his own hand-writing wherein he has mentioned that he had misappropriated the amounts of the society and that he is solely responsible for it and further he has stated in that letter that it

(SRI R. M. PATIL)

will be not respectful of him to continue in life or to survive. Therefore, he wanted to end his life. That also he has mentioned. Therefore, the circumstances are such that on account of his financial distress and also on account of the family feuds and quarrels between brothers and the litigations that led him to commit suicide. He has also written a letter to his brother Kempe Gowda on 20th March 1965. A reading of this letter clerly shows that there was deep distress in the mind of Channiah.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Hon'ble Minister gives the gist of the document, there is no objection. Otherwise, if it is requested, that document will have to be placed on the Table.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Even if the gist is given, if a request is made that letter will have to be placed on the Table of the House, he will have to lay it on the Table.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—I am reading the gist and not the entire contents of the letter. Even in that letter, he has expressed his mind that he has no desire to continue in life and further he wanted Narase Gowda and Kempe Gowda to sink their differences and lead a peaceful life. It also showed that he is determined to end his life. These are the documents which are avilable during the course of the investigations. They do reveal the circumstances under which he ended his own life. Sir, the Government has no intention to shield any officer. Government had never tried to shield any officer much less this Sub Inspector. In the past whenever complaint was made against this officer by either party or any one in that Nuggehalli village, enquiry was made by the higher officers up to the rank of Inspector General of Police. Sir, in this respect, I beg to submit that the Opposition Leader is making capital out of this irresponsibility.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—It is a nonsensical statement. I request the Home Minister to withdrawn his irresponsible statement.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Situations are created. Why ? What purpose does it serve I am unable to understand.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—At this rate is it possible to get any fair treatment at the hands of the Home Minister?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I feel that Sri Shivappa has felt offended at the word 'irresponsibility'. Irresponsibility is used so many times. It was said that this irresponsible Government had no right to remain and it must quit. My recollection is, I have said that even Newton's Law is that action and reaction is equal and opposite. On a prior occasion when the Minister for Law used the word 'incompetent' against the Leader of the Opposition in the course of his reply and when he said that Sri S. Shivappa is incompetent and unfit to be Leader of the Opposition, naturally it hurt him as it would have hurt me if I were there in his place. Sri S. Shivappa said that it was an unparliamentary word and it should not have been used and it should be expunged and he must apologise.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—He asked me to 'shut up', when that was addressed to him.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Even a little strong language is there.

Sri V. M. DEO.—The point is...

Mr. SPEAKER.—The point is nobody should speak till I finish.

And if the words are to be expunged, under what rule? Have I ever held that the word 'irresponsible' is unparliamentary? I do not say it is happy. He should have put it in the negative as Winston Churchil put it when the word False was asked to be withdrawn. In any debate strong language is used. I cannot say that it is the monopoly of any one Party to use strong language. But when such strong language is used, It makes my position delicate.

11-00 A.M.

Sri V. M. DEO.—Sir, you have dealt with it from a limited point of view. The Home Minister by implication clubbed morality with immorality and it is because of that, he used the word. Otherwise, with his experience, under similar circumstances when that took place here several times, to deal with it from that limited view that you have judged, I think it is not doing full justice.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Member is entitled to have his own view of things.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—It would be absolutely unfair to dub Sri Sivappa as irresponsible. The Call Attention Notice is given by Sri K. Lakkappa. I do not know how Mr. Sivappa's name comes into the picture.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Why did his name come into the picture?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Because of his intervention in this very matter.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now this is a call attention motion. The statement has been made by the Hon'ble Minister. If it is necessary, I am prepared to allow half a dozen clarification Questions. Beyond that, it is not possible because we shall not have done any work at all. Today is a non-official day. I am prepared allow till 11-10 a.m. or 11-15 a.m. the members can have clarifications.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Sir, before you allow clarifications on the statement made by the Hon'ble Minister, we have reason to believe that the statement made by the Home Minister does not give full facts of the case. That is number one. Secondly, we have reason to believe that the statement does not contain the whole truth of this matter. Thirdly we have also reason to believe that the Home Minister has prepared the statement in such a fashion as to side-track the issue. Having these three points in view, I would request the Chair to hold over this question so that it may come up again after five or six days by the 5th or 6th of next month, by which time we would have more facts in our possession so that we could confront the Home Minister with the relevant facts.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the request is that no clarification should be permitted to be asked today, but the whole matter should be adjourned. Call Attention there is a full article in this Journal of Parliamentary Information for which I have put up a reference. The entire topic has been dealt with in an exhaustive fashion. I am not aware of any adjournment of such a matter on any occasion whatsoever, because the scope of a matter under Call Attention is very limited. There has been no debate, no conclusion to be arrived at. It is not even a short-notice question. If the Hon'ble Members read the Rule, it is expressly provided: Even if the Hon'ble Minister says: 'I do not have any information or I have no time', it is left to him. The Chair cannot do any thing. Therefore, I have to say this is an extraordinary request made. Is Sri S. M. Krishna aware of any precedent where it has been adjourned like that? I am bound to consider it sympathetically.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—I am not aware of any instance. But this much I can visualise. I have with me rule 63 which does not say that a call attention motion should not be adjourned because certain technical difficulties like getting facts are there. And what would be the result of this? We will not be satisfied or convinced by the statement made by the Hon'ble Home Minister in which case we will have to take recourse to move a special motion. Again the House will have to be seized of that motion and that will come up for debate. In order to save all the trouble for this House, I make this special request that this matter he held over for five or six days by which time we will get all the relevant decisions of the courts. It has been asserted by the Home Minister that strictures have not been passed by the Magistrates in any one case. Now we say certain strictures have been passed. We will have to make some attempt to get copies of judgement and five or six days would be enough. So, it is not a request that cannot be complied with.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—There is another reason why we want it to be postponed. The Hon'ble Home Minister said that he is not in possession of all material particulars.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—I have not said like that.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I see that no investigations must have taken place in regard to the causes of death by this time. Unless it is completed, it cannot be supposed that the Hon'ble Minister would be posted with all the material particulars in that behalf. Once invesigation is completed, all material particulars would be available. The House could be informed of that. So till such time that he can get all the material particulars in pursuance of the investigations into the causes of death, then only it is possible to have a correct view of the picture. Several matters have been detailed in the letter said to have been written by the deceased...

Mr. SPEAKER.—A debate is going on.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—No Sir, I am only supporting the proposal of Sri S. M. Krishna and adducing further reasons why this subject could be taken on some other day, because even the Minister will be in a

better position to answer all the points raised in the letter of the deceased. It is admitted that the letter is written by the deceased himself.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is there anything by way of precedents or previous instances, at any time in any House of Legislature ?

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—There may not be any precedent Sir. This subject might have been raised in some other manner. Since it is a call-attention motion, I already requested earlier that the reply of the Hon'ble Minister could be postponed.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Even when an adjournment motion comes up before the House, they are adjourned because for one reason or the other, if the debate is inconclusive, it has to go on to some other day. When an adjournment motion can be dealt with like that, I am afraid, why not a call attention motion ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Today, we have got a subject matter which has been discussed five times and adjourned six times ; I am not aware when a motion like this has been adjourned. Here it is only a call attention Motion, there is no debate, there is no conclusion to be arrived. The rule says that there shall be no debate on any such statement. But I am trying to see whether there can be a way out. After all, I cannot create bad precedents and this very precedent will be quoted against me. Therefore, I say we must have regard to the nature of the work. This is a call attention motion. The statement of the Minister is already made. The matter ends. But in order to accommodate, I have suggested some clarifications could be asked. But even before that is done, I am asked to take a further step it to Adjourn. After all, if a little time is given what harm does it do ? I will see that it is not treated as a precedent. It may go into the records like that.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—There are other ways of eliciting information rather than adjourning this motion. It will be going beyond the scope of the motion itself. As the Chair expressed that the matter is ended and the statement is made, I think it is not advisable to postpone this matter. The Hon'ble Members have got ample opportunity.

Mr. SPEAKER.—How and when ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—There is short notice question. I can answer even today if the sitting is extended.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let us not divert. The suggestion for a short notice question is there ..

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Then a notice under rule 59 may have not been given. I do not want...

Mr. SPEAKER.—When the rules are very clear, if I once create a precedent, it becomes bad. I cannot take back what I say here and later on refuse another. However, I will allow two or three clarifications. And then the Minister has given a hint as to how you can bring in the subject.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯನವರು ಗ್ಯಾಂಬ್ಲರ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಯಾವ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಾದರೂ ರುಜುವಾತಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ? ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ದಾಖಲೆ, ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶ ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿದೆಯೇ ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—There is sufficient evidence to prove that he was a gambler.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Has he been convicted by any Court?

Mr. SPEAKER.—As I said, this clarification will go on if necessary till 11-30 a.m. Members should rigidly adhere to the rules and should not unnecessarily complicate the situation.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I would like to know whether the fact that he was a gambler has been proved and there is a finding in any Court of Law. It is criminal jurisprudence that all persons are innocent unless they are proved otherwise.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—In the past it is not proved. But there is evidence to prove.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Unless it is proved beyond doubt, how can the Hon'ble Minister say that he was a gambler ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—It has been replied already.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, a most uncharitable comment has been made by the Home Minister that the deceased person, though he sacrificed his life, was a gambler...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—What is the clarification the Hon'ble Member requires ?

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Suppose I call the Home Minister a gambler, will he accept ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Hon'ble Members must not and cannot make an allegation and defame another.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I said "suppose"

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Sir, we know that the Home Minister is not a gambler. Supposing it is said...

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I know that he is a good person. I know he is a very good man.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—If the Home Minister is not able to substantiate the allegation he has made, it has to be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Minister said that he has got evidence to prove that he was a gambler. If the Member wants a clarification, he my ask.

Sri S. SIVAPPA. I want to know if any judicial pronouncement has been made to the effect that he was a gambler. If it is not there, on what grounds does the Hon'ble Minister call him a gambler ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—During the course of investigation in this matter there is material to establish that fact.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Unless and until it has been proved in a Court of Law...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Is the Hon'ble Member going to debate on the point whether there is sufficient evidence or not ?

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—He says that the deceased person was a gambler.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—He said that there is evidence.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Evidence collected by whom? By a Sub Inspector of Police?

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Investigation cannot be taken as proof. The Hon'ble Minister is aware of it. Evidence in the course of investigation cannot take the place of proof unless it is proved beyond doubt. Until and unless that is done, how can the Home Minister hold that he is a gambler?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—It requires no clarification. It is only a matter of presumption.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Has the Hon'ble Minister withdrawn it?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is no question of withdrawing.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Then here on the floor of the House, can we say that any person is a gambler just as the Home Minister has stated, that Channiah is a gambler?

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Here there is a case of selfimmolation of Mr. Channiah and on the basis of evidence supplied by the Sub Inspector, the Minister says that he has come to the conclusion that he is a gambler. Is it correct?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—He has not stated like that. He has said that he has some evidence to show that he is a gambler.

(*Interruption*)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—No incriminating remark is allowed on the Floor of the House.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Suppose I say that the Home Minister is gambling with the lives of the people?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Minister has stated about the evidence he has.

Sri V. M. DEO.—I want a clarification on three counts. Is it not a very unhappy thing that these things are going on, when the person involved, *i.e.*, the Chief Minister of the State......

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—What is the clarification that the Hon'ble Member wants? Members are anxious to gather information. Please don't make a statement but ask for information.

Sri V. M. DEO.—By what has happened so far, have not the Chief Minister's Cabinet colleagues, which includes the Home Minister, left the Chief Minister's conscience in trouble, particularly in regard to this? When these things occurred, he was not in the State. Secondly, does not the statement made by the Home Minister imply that irrespective of justice, they have decided what to do with it and a departmental enquiry is held which is a white wash? They have already said that the man is nefarious and the man is guilty. Finally, has it not struck the Home Minister that whatever

(SRI V. M. DEO)

he has stated, without allowing the Chief Minister to face us, is irrelavent, taking away the time of this August House ? Whether he would at least take measures now so that the Chief Minister comes and faces us if his conscious is clear ? Otherwise, one important thing is clear. It only means that in this particular crisis of falling standards, we are also part of it. At least we will wake up now.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Sir, I am extremely sorry to submit to this House that the points for clarification raised by the Hon'ble Member are confusing and he himself is not clear about them and therefore, I am not in a position to answer those points.

Sri V. M. DEO.—Confusion is not on my part; it is on the part of the Government.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಆರ್. ಕೇಶವಮೂರ್ತಿ (ಗಂಡಸಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೊಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯನವರ ಆತ್ಮ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಆಗತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಬಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯುವುದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಅರಿವನ್ನು ಮರೆತು, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಗೃಹಸಚಿವರು ಈಗ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯನವರ ಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಡಂತೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಾಕ್ಯಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಇವೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಒಳಗೊಂಡ ಒಂದು ಕಾಂಪ್ರೆಹೆನ್ಸಿವ್ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯನವರು ಗ್ಯಾಂಬ್ಲರ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇದು ಏಕಪಕ್ಷೀಯ ವಾದವನ್ನು ಒಳಗೊಂಡಂತೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಸಬ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರು ನಮ್ಮ ಚುನಾವಣಾ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದ ಕೆಲವು ಭಾಗಕ್ಕೆ ಸಬ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರಾಗಿಯೂ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷದ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಬಾರದ ಕೃತ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಜನಗಳ ಮನಸ್ಸನ್ನು ನೋಯಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು ಅಸಮ್ಮತವಾದ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಆಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಖಂಡಿತ ವಾಗಿ ತಾವು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮನ್ನಣೆ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇರೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಬೇರೆ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ಆದೇಶ ನೀಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is nothing requiring clarification.

Sri P. VENKATAGIRIYAPPA (Kolar).—Is it the information of the Government that the Sub-Inspector is at no fault so far as this incident is concerned and that he has discharged his duty impartially in this place ? Is that the opinion of the Government ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—That question does not arise here Sir.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH (Mudigere).—The main point of allegation of Sri S. Sivappa and some other friends who spoke on the other day is that the statement made on the Floor of the House gave encouragement to the Sub-Inspector to harass Sri Channiah and that was the reason for Sri Channiah's ending his life. May I ask through you whether the Government has made any attempt to know the fact or otherwise of the allegations ? I want to know from the Minister for Home categorically whether the Minister has made any attempt to know the fact or otherwise and whether he has got any information with regard to this point ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Sir, I have made a statement in respect of complaints or allegations made against the Sub-Inspector. I caused enquiries to be made. The D.I.G. and the I.G. have enquired into this matter. So far as harassment is concerned, there is no harassment in this.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಕಾಗದದಲ್ಲಿ ಆತನ ಕೊಲೆಗೆ ಕಾರಣ ಹೊನ್ನಯ್ಯ ಎಂದು ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾನೆ. ಆ ಕಾಗದವನ್ನು ಆತನ ಕೈಯಿಂದಲೇ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾನೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಕಾಗದ ತಲುಪಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಆತನನ್ನು ಅರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಲೀ, ಆತನ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಲೀ ತಕ್ಷಣ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ? ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Such complaints used to come before also. So, the enquiry was to be made and enquiry was made.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ಧಪ್ಪ.—ಒಬ್ಬ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ಸಾಯುವಾಗ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಬರೆದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ ಮನ್ನಣೆ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪದೆ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಕಳಿಸಿ, ಸುತ್ತ ಮುತ್ತಲ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳವರ ಎವಿಡೆನ್ಸ್ ಏನಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನೂ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ಷ್ಯಾಬಿ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟು ದೇಶದ ಅನಾಹುತಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಾಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದಿರುವ ಪತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಅವರು ಏಕೆ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Sir, the machinery is an established machinery. Simply because my Hon'ble friends are not satisfied with the machinery, we cannot establish a special machinery for such things.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಬೈರಪ್ಪಾಜಿ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಗೃಹಸಚಿವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಸತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ದೂರವಾದ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಆ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಥಳಕ್ಕೆ ಶುಕ್ರವಾರ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದೆ. ಕೇವಲ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಬಾರದು. ಹಾಸನ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಟ್ರೆಜರಿ ಬೆಂಚಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರನೇಕರು ಇಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನನ್ನ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಟ್ಟರೆ ಹೋಗೋಣ. ಆ ಸಬ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್‌ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ 135 ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಿವೆ. ನಾವು ಆ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ಕೆಲವು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಿಗಾದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಭೇಟಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಆ ಜನತೆಯ ಕಷ್ಟ ಸುಖವೇನು, ಆ ಸಬ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರನಿಂದ ದೊರಕಿರುವ ಸುಖವೇನು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿದೆ. ಈ ಒಂದು ಕೆಲಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರು ಸಹಕಾರಿಗಳಾಗಲಿ. ಆ ಕಡೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಹಾಸನ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ನಾವು ಕೆಲವರು ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಲಿ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಸಬ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರ ನೀತಿ ನಿಯಮಗಳು, ಆತನ ನಡತೆ, ನಾಲ್ಕು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಆತನು ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ರೀತಿ ಇವುಗಳಿಂದ ದೇಶದ ಹಿತಕ್ಕೆ, ಜನತೆಯ ಹಿತಕ್ಕೆ, ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ಉಳಿವಿಗೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ಇದೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರನ್ನು ನಮ್ರತೆಯಿಂದ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಲಘುವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅಥವಾ ಏನೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸತ್ತನೆಂದು ಲಘುವಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಗೌರವ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

11-30 A.M.

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಅವರು ಹೇಳುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಲಘುವಾಗಿ ಕಂಡಿರುವೆವು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಭಾವಿಸಿರುವುದು ತಪ್ಪು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ತೀಕ್ಷ್ಣವಿದೆಯೋ ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ನಮಗೆ ತೀಕ್ಷ್ಣವಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಬೈರಪ್ಪಾಜಿ.—ಆ ರೀತಿ ಇರಬೇಕಾದುದು ಸಹಜ.

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫೀಕೇಷನ್ ಏನಾದರೂ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಕೇಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಬೈರಪ್ಪಾಜಿ.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಆಸಕ್ತಿ ಇದೆಯೆಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯರೂಪಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದು ಈ ಪ್ರಕರಣದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸತ್ಯಾಂಶವನ್ನು ದೇಶದ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಸತ್ಯಾಂಶ ಇಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಉದ್ದೇಶ. ಅದೇ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಯಂತ್ರ ಬೇರೆ ಇದೆ. ಆ ಯಂತ್ರ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಆರ್. ಕೇಶವಮೂರ್ತಿ—ನಾನು ಮೊದಲನಿಂದಲೂ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.ಈ ಆತ್ಮಹತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣರಾದ ಈ ಸಬ್‌ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದ ಯಾವ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯೂ ನಡೆದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ ಆ ಸಬ್‌ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರು ನಡೆಸಿದ ದುರಾಡಳಿತ. ಆ ದುರಾಡಳಿತದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ತನಿಖೆ ನಡೆಸಿ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಯಾಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದವರನ್ನು ಕೂಡಲೇ ನೇಮಿಸಬೇಕು.

Sri S. V. AGNIHOTRI (Dharwar).—On a point of order, Sir.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—I rise to another point of order, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There cannot be a point of order to a point of order.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—My point of order is that the Hon'ble Member Agnihotri is not in his proper place.

(The Hon'ble Member Sri S. V. Agnihotri came to his seat.)

Sri S. V. AGNIHOTRI.—They say 'murder' whereas the report is that it is suicide. In view of that, is it in order to say that it is murder ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—That is their opinion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಆರ್. ಕೇಶವಮೂರ್ತಿ.—ಸಬ್‌ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂರ್ಣ ತನಿಖೆ ನಡೆಸಿ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ನಡೆಸಲು ಇವರು ತಯಾರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಈ ಸಬ್‌ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಅವಧಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಏನೇನು ನಡೆದಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತನಿಖೆಮಾಡಿ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯೋಗ್ಯ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಿ ಯೋಗ್ಯ ಕ್ರಮಕೈಗೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಈ ಆತ್ಮಹತ್ಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯೋಗ್ಯವಾದ ತನಿಖೆ ನಡೆದಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಇದ್ದ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ವಿವರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ವಿಷಯ ಈಗ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುದುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ವಿಷಯ ಗೊತ್ತಾದಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಭಾಸ್ಕರಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಈಗ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಒಂದು ಕಾಗದವನ್ನು ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರಾರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ, ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಾಗದವನ್ನು ಅವರ ಸಹೋದರ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆಂಪೇ ಗೌಡರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಕಾಗದ ಪತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ಇಡಬೇಕು. ಅವನ್ನು ಯಾವ ತಾರೀಖಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದರ ಒರಿಜಿನಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆಂಪೇಗೌಡರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ತಾರೀಖು 20-3-65ರಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರಾರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ತಾರೀಖು ಕೂಡ 20-3-65ರಲ್ಲಿ.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—If the Hon'ble Minister is quoting from the letters, he will have to place it on the Table ; but if he is giving only the gist, it is not necessary.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—It is not necessary to place every document on the table of the House: I have given only the gist.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ಸಬ್‌ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಪ್ರಾಮಾಣಿಕ, ದಕ್ಷ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಫೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರು. ಅದಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವರು ಬರೆದ ಕಾಗದದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಿದೆಯೆಂದರೆ, ಇನ್ನೂ ಉನ್ಮತ್ತದಿಂದ ಇವರು ಅವನಿಗೆ ಬೆಂಬಲವನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟುದ ರಿಂದ ಆತನು ಇನ್ನೂ ಘೋರ ಕೃತ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವ ಒಂದು ಕಾರ್ಯ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಯಿತು. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ

ನನಗೆ ಯಾರಿಂದಲೂ ಕೂಡ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಸಿಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಆ ಕಾಗದದಲ್ಲಿ ಆತ ಕಾಣಿಸಿದ್ದಾನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ತನಿಖೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೇನು ತೊಂದರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಈಗ ಕಳೆದ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಹಿಂದೆ 1963-64ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದಂಥ ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷ ಎರಡು, ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವರ್ಷ ಎರಡು—ಹೀಗೆ 4 ಕೇಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಆಗ ಎರಡು ಪಕ್ಷಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಇನ್‌ವೆಸ್ಟಿಗೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೇಸು ಹಾಕಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾಮಾಣಿಕರೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸುವುದು ಸ್ವಾಭಾವಿಕ. ಅವರು ಯಾವ ಪಕ್ಷವನ್ನೂ ಅವಲಂಬಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀ ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯನವರು ಬರೆದ ಕಾಗದ ಸತ್ಯವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂರ್ಣ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂದೇ ಪೂರ್ಣ ಎನ್‌ಕ್ವೈರಿ ನಡೆದಿದೆ.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Since the Government say that the matter is under enquiry, it is better not to press further.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಆರ್. ಕೇಶವಮೂರ್ತಿ.—ಗತಿಸಿದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯನವರು ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ವಾಕ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅವರು ನಡೆದಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಬರೆದು ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಓದುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾದ ತಾವು ನನಗೆ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಓದಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಆರ್. ಕೇಶವಮೂರ್ತಿ.—ಅದು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ: "ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಎಸ್. ನಿಜಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪನವರೇ, ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ವರ್ಗದಿಂದ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಸಂಸಾರಗಳು ನಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತಾ ಇವೆ ಎಂಬುದು ನಿಮಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯದಾಗಿದೆ. ನುಗ್ಗೇಹಳ್ಳಿ ಸಬ್‌ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಎಸ್. ಹೊನ್ನಯ್ಯನು ಬಂದು ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಾಯಿತು. ಈತನು ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ತೊಂದರೆ, ಜನಗಳಿಂದ ಸುಲಿಯುತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಣ ಹೇಳತೀರದಾಗಿದೆ. ಈತನು ಈ ರೇಂಜಿಗೆ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಜನಗಳಿಂದ ಹದಿನೈದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಅನ್ಯಥಾ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ. ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ, ಲಂಚದ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ, ಇದುವರೆವಿಗೂ ಈತನು ಇಲ್ಲದ ಸಲ್ಲದ ಕೇಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಅಂದರೆ ಸುಮಾರು 200 ಕೇಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿ ಒಂದೂ ಸಹ ರುಜುವಾತು ಕೊಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂತಹವರನ್ನು ದಕ್ಷ, ಪ್ರಾಮಾಣಿಕರೆಂದು ಯಾವ ಬಾಯಿಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ ? ಇದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನೀವೇ ಕಾರಣರು. ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಉದ್ಧಾರ ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಇತರ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ತುಳಿಯುವುದೇ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇವರಿಂದ ಗುಂಡಾಗಿರಿಯಿಂದ, ಅಧಿಕಾರ ದರ್ಪದಿಂದ, ಪುಡಾರಿಗಳ ಕಾಟದಿಂದ, ಮೋಸದಿಂದ, ಲಂಚದಿಂದ, ಇತರರನ್ನು ತುಳಿಯುವುದರಿಂದ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸನ್ನು ಉದ್ಧಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನಾಶವೇ ವಿನಹ ಉದ್ಧಾರವಾಗಲಾರದು. ಈ ಸಬ್‌ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಈ ರೇಂಜಿಗೆ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಸುಮಾರು ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾನೆ. ಈತನು ಪುಂಡರಿಗೆ, ಗೂಂಡಾಗಳಿಗೆ ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅದರಿಂದ ಗೌರವಸ್ಥರಿಗೆ, ಮರ್ಯಾದಸ್ಥರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆ ಕೊಡಿಸುವುದು, ಪುಂಡರಿಂದ ಕೇಸನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಸುವುದು, ಜೈಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಹೆದರಿಸುವುದು, ಮರ್ಯಾದೆಗೆ ಅಂಜಿ ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು......" ಇವರು ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ತೊಂದರೆ ಬಹಳವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಜುಡಿಷಿಯಲ್ ಎನ್‌ಕ್ವೈರಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅವರು ಪ್ರಾಣ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಬ್‌ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರೇ ಕಾರಣರಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆದಿದೆ. ಆ ಕೇಸಿನ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್‌ವೆಸ್ಟಿಗೇಷನ್ ನಡೆದಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ಒಂದು ಕೇಸ್ ರೆಫರ್ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order. It was agreed that the Debate should close at 11-30 A.M. Now it is 11-40 A.M. and still the hon'ble members want more time. I am very sorry.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—It is only some clarification.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The matter does not end there I am not allowing any clarifications.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Only one clarification, Sir. With respect to the pending cases between the Government and the parties, the Minister was pleased to state that the cases have been discharged as against Channaiah and other parties. Is it not a fact that the Court has passed strictures that the Sub-Inspector is incompetent and has taken a partisan attitude? This has been stated in a judgement in a case that has been disposed of against Mr. Channaiah.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—If my friend produces that judgement, we shall examine.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The next item is the Resolution of Sri V. S. Patil. It has been agreed that it will stand postponed to some other day. The next resolution is by Sri Srinivas Naik he may move it.

NON-OFFICIAL RESOLUTION

Re: Merger of Kannada areas of Kasargod taluk in Kerala State with Mysore State.

Sri M. SRINIVASA NAYAK (Mangalore-I).—I beg to move:

> "That this Assembly recommends to the State Government to urge the Government of India to take immediate steps for the merger of the Kannada areas of Kasargod taluk in Kerala State with Mysore State."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Resolution moved:

> "That this Assembly recommends to the State Government to urge the Government of India to take immediate steps for the merger of the Kannada areas of Kasargod taluk in Kerala State with Mysore State."

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸನಾಯಕ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳವರೇ, ಕಾಸರಗೋಡನ್ನು ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರ್ಪಡಿಸುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹಲವು ಭಾರಿ ಈ ಘನವಾದ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಕ್ಕಡೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಪೂರ್ಣ ಬೆಂಬಲವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿ ಕೇಳಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಈಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಸಮಯದ ಹಿಂದೆ ಕನ್ನಡನಾಡಿಗೆ ಸ್ಪರ್ಧೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕಾಸರಗೋಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ಸರ್ವಪಕ್ಷ ಸಮ್ಮೇಳನ ನಡೆದಾಗ ಪ್ರತಿ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಮುಂಖಡರೂ ಕೂಡ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿ ಈ ಕೇಳಿಕೆಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಬೆಂಬಲವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಠರಾವುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಮಾಡಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಮತ್ತು ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಕೇರಳದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕಾಸರಗೋಡನ್ನು ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ವಾತಾವರಣ ಉಂಟಾಗಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತಹ ಒಂದು ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಈ ಒಂದು ಠರಾವನ್ನು ಈ ಘನವಾಧ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥಮಾಡಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮತ್ತು ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಒಮ್ಮತವಾದ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಈ ಠರಾವನ್ನು ಸರ್ವ ಸಮ್ಮತವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯವರು